

41319-904846

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the application of : Elberse, Arik
Serial No. : 09/707,015
Filed : November 6, 2000
For : Method of Using a Web-Browser to Pass
Information from a First Web-Entity to One of
a Plurality of Second Web-Entities
Examiner : Lezak, Arrienne M.
Art Unit : 2143
Customer number : 23644

REPLY BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER
MAILED MARCH 21, 2006.

Honorable Director of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed March 21, 2006, the appellant submits the following reply brief.

REPLY BRIEF

Appellant notes that in section “5. Summary of Invention” of the Examiner’s Answer, the Examiner indicates that “*The summary of the invention contained within the brief is correct*”. However, in section “8. Response to Arguments” of the Examiner’s Answer, the Examiner contends that “*Appellant’s claims do not disclose the invention the Appellant so vehemently argues and portrays in Exhibit 1*”. The Examiner then proceeds to detail a number of features the Examiner contends are not taught by appellant’s claims. Appellant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s analysis as will be addressed below, but notes that this is the first occasion in the examination and appeal procedure to date that Examiner’s has raised such issues against appellant’s use of Exhibit 1 to explain the present invention. It would appear that the Examiner is attempting to discredit the appellant’s claims as being deficient thereby creating a new ground of rejection of such claims.

Addressing the specific issues raised by the Examiner:

- appellant does refer to “client web browser” in section “(v) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter” of appellant’s appeal brief. Appellant accepts that the independent claims under appeal are not limited to a client web browser. This is an oversight which the appellant regrets. However, appellant submits that the “Summary of Claimed Subject Matter” of appellant’s Appeal Brief when read with the word client struck out remains completely valid and the issue of whether the web browser is a client web browser or otherwise is immaterial to the appeal process. Appellant also submits that the Examiner well understands that Exhibit 1 is a visual representation of an exemplary embodiment of the invention.

- it is irrelevant to the claimed invention as to what triggers an initial connection between the web browser and the one of a plurality of first web entities. This is not a feature essential for defining the invention.

- it is irrelevant to the claimed invention how the web browser receives the address of the second web entity. It is merely necessary that the web browser does have the address. The specification explains how the web browser comes into possession of the second web entity's address, but this is not a feature essential for defining the invention.

- as is well known in the art and as disclosed in the primary prior art reference (Kirsch, US6466966), a redirection server may redirect a web browser to another web entity by providing to the web browser redirection information (a redirection message) for connecting to the another web entity. It is possible that the redirection server could, as implied by the Examiner, act like a switch or router by redirecting the web browser through itself to the another web entity, but this is unlikely since it would be wasteful of the redirection server's bandwidth resources. However, it is immaterial to the present appeal how the redirection server redirects, i.e. connects, the web browser to the second web entity.

- the additional information is passed from the web browser to the second web entity once the redirection server has redirected the web browser to the second web entity. Even if the redirection server acts like a switch or router as implied by the Examiner, the additional information is still passed from the web browser to the second web entity. That is, the additional information will pass from the web browser through the redirection server to the second web entity. The Examiner's suggestion that this cannot happen is illogical and simply wrong.

The Examiner has noted that certain embodiments of Kirsch (US6466966) do teach away from appellant's claimed invention so at least the appellant and Examiner have one point of agreement.

The Examiner indicates that it is that embodiment of Kirsch depicted by figures 5 to 7 and described at column 13, lines 6 to 64 that is relied on to demonstrate that appellant's claimed invention is anticipated by Kirsch. The Examiner explains the ground of rejection in section "7. Grounds of Rejection", paragraph 5 of the Examiner's Answer. The Examiner indicates that the feature of the claimed invention of *"passing the additional information from the web browser to the second web entity"* is disclosed at column 13, lines 35 to 43 of Kirsch. Appellant respectfully disagrees.

In figures 5 to 7 of Kirsch, the client computer system 80 comprises the "web browser" of the claimed invention. The web page server system 82 can be considered the "one of a plurality of first web entities" (first web entity for convenience), the redirection server 88 can be considered as the "redirection server" and the second web page server system 90 can be considered as the "second web entity". As is clear from column 13, lines 6 to 67, no additional information is ever passed from the web page server system 82 (first web entity) to the second web page server system 90 (second web entity) via the client computer system 80 (web browser) after said client computer system 80 (web browser) has been redirected by the redirection server 88 to the second web page server system 90 (second web entity). The additional information (i.e. web page element 86) provided in web page 84 by the web page server system 82 (first web entity) as taught by Kirsch only ever reaches the redirection server 88 since the purpose of the web page element 86 (embedded information) is to control operation of the web browser on the client computer system 80 to issue a notification URL 98 to the redirection server 88 (column 13, lines 24 to 28). The Examiner has concluded that the web page 92 issued by the second web page server system 90 was inferentially referenced by the web page element 86 embedded within the web page 84 provided by the (first) web page server system 82 thereby confirming appellant's submission that no additional information is passed from the first web page server system 82 to the second web page server system 90 via the web browser of the client computer system 80 upon it


being redirected by the redirection server 88 to the second web page server system 90. Consequently, the Examiner should now be able to agree with the appellant that Kirsch does not teach all of the claim limitations of the claimed invention and that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Kirsch.

The Examiner's responsive arguments concerning the combination of Kirsch with Narendran (US6070191) are moot in view of the fact that Kirsch does not disclose additional information being passed from one of a plurality of first web entities to a second web entity via a web browser upon it being redirected by a redirection server to the second web entity.

The appeal should be sustained and the rejections reversed.

May 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William M. Lee, Jr.", is written over a horizontal line.

William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 (fax)